



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/707,738

01/08/2004

YING-CHING LEE

12194-US-PA

1737

31561

7590

05/10/2006

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100

ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2

TAIPEI, 100

TAIWAN

EXAMINER

MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2112

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/707,738

Applicant(s)

LEE, YING-CHING

Examiner

Paul R. Myers

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/14/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to applicants argument that Kuan fails to disclose, teach or suggest “a device capable of integrating a card reading function and an instruction-input function”: This is clearly incorrect the keyboard device 100 integrates the card-reading function (at 10 see figures 1-3) and an instruction-input function (via the keys and circuit 50 See figures 1-3).

In regards to applicants argument that Kuan does not teach “an integrated chip electrically coupling the ... the memory card”: The examiner agrees. That is why the rejection was a 103 instead of 102. Official notice was taken that keyboards normally include printed circuit boards with IC chips. See also MPEP 2144.04 V. B.

In regards to applicants argument that the USC controller 40 is alleged to be an integrated chip by the examiner: This is incorrect. The examiner did not state that the controller of Kuan was an IC chip. The examiner stated that IC chips were well known and it would have been obvious to use IC chips. See also MPEP 2144.04 V. B.

In regards to applicants argument that Chung fails to disclose, teach or suggest “a device capable of integrating a card reading function and an instruction-input function”: This is clearly incorrect the Mouse 1 (See figs 2 and 5) integrates the card-reading function (at 15 see figures 5) and an instruction-input function (via 14 See figures 5).

In regards to applicants argument that “the Examiner assumed the data processor 13 for performing the card-reading function and the coordinate output circuit 14 for performing the

Art Unit: 2112

instruction-input function, as also shown in figure 5, they are not integrated”: The examiner again agrees. However the rejection was a 103 instead of 102 and Official notice was taken that printed circuit boards with IC chips are very well known. See also MPEP 2144.04 V. B.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuan US 2002/0109675.

In regards to claim 1: Kuan teaches a device capable of integrating a card-reading function (20) and an instruction-input function (50), having a transmission interface (60') for coupling to an external device (60), comprising: a memory card connector (10) for electrically coupling a memory card (30) and accessing the memory card (30); a human-machine interface module (50) for storing an outside instruction and producing a break instruction (keyboard interrupt); and an integrated chip (40) electrically coupling to the transmission interface (60'), the memory card connector (10) and the human-machine interface module (50), wherein the integrated chip is capable of parallel processing (multiple pipes as per USB specification)

Art Unit: 2112

input/output of the memory card connector (10) and transmitting the break instruction (interrupt) from the human-machine interface module (50) to the external device (60). Kuan does not expressly state that the circuitry of figure 2 is implemented on a PCB and that the USB controller is an IC. Official notice is taken that keyboards normally include a PCB with controller IC's. It would have been obvious to include the circuitry of Kuan on a PCB because this would have allowed for ease in manufacturing.

In regards to claims 2-3: Kuan teaches the interface being a USB interface.

In regards to claim 6: Kuan teaches a socket for the memory card.

In regards to claim 7: Kuan's memory card uses at least one format.

In regards to claim 8: Kuan's keyboard is a button type receiver.

In regards to claim 9: Kuan's device includes a cover (the casing of the keyboard) and a keyboard as input media.

4. Claim 4-5, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuan US 2002/0109675 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of what is well known in the art as evidenced by Milan PN 6,607,408.

In regards to claims 4-5, 12: Kuan teaches the interface being serial. Official notice is taken that serial to parallel conversion is well known in the art including for USB. It would have been obvious to use a parallel port for the keyboard of Kuan because this would have allowed for backwards compatibility to older systems that used a parallel port for the keyboard.

Art Unit: 2112

5. Claim 1-3, 6-11, 13-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung US 2002/0167470.

In regards to claims 1, 10, 16: Chung teaches a device capable of integrating a card-reading function (13) and an instruction-input function (14), having a transmission interface (15) for coupling to an external device (3), comprising: a memory card connector (2-13) for electrically coupling a memory card (2) and accessing the memory card (2); a human-machine interface module (14) for storing an outside instruction and producing a break instruction (mouse interrupt); and an integrated chip (11) electrically coupling to the transmission interface (15), the memory card connector (13) and the human-machine interface module (14), wherein the integrated chip is capable of parallel processing (multiple pipes as per USB specification) input/output of the memory card connector (2-13) and transmitting the break instruction (interrupt) from the human-machine interface module (14) to the external device (3). Chung does not expressly state that the circuitry of figure 5 is implemented on a PCB and that the USB controller is an IC. Official notice is taken that PCB's with controller IC's are well known. It would have been obvious to include the circuitry of Chung on a PCB with an IC chip because this would have allowed for ease in manufacturing.

In regards to claims 2-3: Chung teaches the interface being a USB interface.

In regards to claim 6: Chung teaches a socket for the memory card.

In regards to claims 7, 14 and 20: Chung memory card uses at least one format.

In regards to claims 8, 15 and 21: Chung Mouse is a button type receiver.

In regards to claim 9: Chung device includes a cover (16) and a Mouse as input media.

Art Unit: 2112

In regards to claims 11, 17: Chung teaches USB which includes a SIE.

In regards to claim 13, 19: Chung teaches a micro controller running on a program (11).

Further The USB specification includes buffering.

6. Claims 4-5, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung US 2002/0167470 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of what is well known in the art as evidenced by Milan PN 6,607,408.

In regards to claims 4-5, 12, 18: Chung teaches the interface being serial. Official notice is taken that serial to parallel conversion is well known in the art including for USB. It would have been obvious to use a parallel port for the keyboard of Kuan because this would have allowed for backwards compatibility to older systems that used a parallel port for the keyboard.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2112

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 571 272 3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571-272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

PRM
May 8, 2006